

Amendments to the Drawings:

Please delete FIG. 2.

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending.

The specification is objected to under 35 USC 132(a).

Claims 1 and 3-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Claims 1, 3, and 5-15 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Swartz in view of Goldman.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Swartz in view of Goldman and further in view of Yost.

Claims 16-20 stand rejected under USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kiss in view of Swartz.

Changes in the Claims:

Claims 1 and 15 have been amended.

Claims 16-20 have been canceled.

No new matter has been added.

Objection to the specification and drawings:

The specification is objected to under 35 USC 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure.

FIG. 2 and Paragraphs [0005.1], [0018.1]-[0018.7] have been deleted.

The objection is therefore now moot. Applicants respectfully request that the present objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph:

Claims 1 and 3-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 3-15 are supported by the specification.

The limitation of “user-defined form” recited in Claim 1 is supported by paragraph [0007]: “the existing knowledge base is organized 20 in a form and format that offers maximum flexibility in accessing the knowledge throughout the organization and allows expansion and enhancement of the knowledge base is a controller, supervised, and

quality-assured manner”, paragraph [0009]: “each step … may be defined by a plurality of fields or categories of information”, and paragraph [0010]: “the fields listed above are merely exemplary, and many more may be included depending upon the type of knowledge being captured and organized” among other paragraphs.

The limitations of “abstracting the captured knowledge using meta data” and “the indexed database structured according to the abstracted captured knowledge” in Claim 1 is supported by paragraph [0009]: “each step … may be defined by a plurality of fields or categories of information”, paragraph [0011]: “such a form-based approach may be used to capture a particular knowledge base into a logically organize, usable form”, Appendix A, page 5, Section 2.2.1.1.1: “once properly codified, the information is transformed into a powerful tool…”, Appendix A, page 11, Section 3.2.1.2.1.1: “by establishing an association between these instances of information…”, Appendix A, page 13, Section 3.2.2.1.1.3: “set of identifying keywords”, “derives context via its association with one or more links” among other paragraphs.

The limitation of “providing timely and relevant information to a selected user based on predefined and user-modifiable preferences” in Claim 3 is supported by paragraph [0018]: “the database is updated automatically, by organizing, indexing and link, every time new information is input into the system, such as through a workflow”, paragraph [0011]: “such a form-based approach may be used to capture a particular knowledge base into a logically organize, usable form” among other paragraphs.

Rejection under 35 USC §103(a) – claims 1, 3 and 5-15

Claims 1, 3, and 5-15 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Swartz in view of Goldman. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Under MPEP §706.02(j), in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness required for a §103 rejection, three basic criteria must be met: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references or knowledge generally available to modify the reference or combine reference teachings (MPEP §2143.01), (2) a reasonable expectation of success (MPEP §2143.02), and (3) the prior art must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (MPEP §2143.03). See In re Royka, 490 F. 2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed combination of Swartz and Goldman does not teach or suggest the claim limitations of Claims 1, 3, and 5-15.

Swartz describes a knowledge integration apparatus for various independent software applications. In particular, Swartz teaches a “**user-specific** taxonomy/classification hierarchy. For example, it may be employed to create a familiar regulatory environment, using a 3-D workspace, containing all of the data and information repositories, their buildings, people...” See Col. 18, line 40. Thus, the apparatus in Swartz is **user-specific** and tailored to the user so as to provide a familiar interface to the user based on the user’s industry – e.g. pharmaceutical as illustrated in Swartz. Swartz does not teach “**user-defined forms**” where a user is defining one or more forms.

Furthermore, Swartz teaches “capturing knowledge and storing the knowledge in **the form of documents**” as illustrated in FIGS. 6-17. However, Swartz is silent as to a “**user-defined form**”. In Swartz, the forms are already defined by the various independent software applications and thus **cannot** be defined or modified by the user.

See FIGS. 6-17.

Goldman describes workflows. However, Goldman is silent as to any “**user-defined forms**”.

Applicant therefore submits that neither Swartz nor Goldman teach or describe “capturing existing knowledge with **user-defined forms**” as recited in Claims 1 and 15.

Thus, Applicant submits that claims 1, 3, and 5-15 recite novel subject matter which distinguishes over any possible combination of Swartz and Goldman.

Rejection under 35 USC §103(a) – Claim 4

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Swartz in view of Goldman and further in view of Yost.

These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the reason that each of the rejected claims ultimately depend on an above-discussed base claim. The arguments set forth above regarding the base claims are equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

Rejection under 35 USC §103(a) – Claims 16-20

Claims 16-20 stand rejected under USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kiss in view of Swartz.

Claims 16-20 have been canceled. This rejection is now moot.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicants submit that the amended claims are now in proper form, and that the amended claims all define patentable subject matter over the prior art. Therefore, Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance.

Request for allowance

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 3, 2006



Thierry K. Lo
Reg. No. 49,097